

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,362	09/16/2003	Roger Massengale	IFLOW.149A	1650	
20995 KNORRE MA	7590 07/29/200 RTENS OLSON & BE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN S'	MAIN STREET KOHAR			KI, CHRISTOPHER	
FOURTEENT IRVINE, CA 9		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,		3763			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/29/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/663,362	MASSENGALE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CHRISTOPHER D. KOHARSKI	3763		

	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
		CHRISTOPHER D. KOHARSKI	3763				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE	REPLY FILED 20 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.131; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
	☐ The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.			
have under set fo may r	sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s th in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later educe any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AME	NDMENTS						
3. 🔀	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	E below);				
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a company of the company o			ne issues for			
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted claims.				
4. 🗆	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. 🗀	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. 🗆	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. 🗀	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided to the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. 🗌	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a			
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
KEW	The request for reconsideration has been considered because: See Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for	allowance			
12. Г	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
	Other:	,					
	cholas D Lucchesi/	/Christopher D Koharsk	i/				
Sur	pervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763	Evanger Art Unit 2702					

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims raise new considerations and elemental/operational elements/functions drawn to the spatial location of the layers and therefore change the scope of the applicant's claim and would require further additional search and consideration.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner has fully considered applicant's arguments but they are not persuasive. It is examiner sposition that given a careful reading, the claims do not distinguish over the prior art of record. The examiner has given the broadest reasonable definition of the frist and second opposing walls in the claims and the Applicant's representatives arguments fail to convince of an otherwise meaning. Examiner asserts that the reference discloses first and second walls (22 and 18) as stated in the previous office action. The prior art of record teaches all elements as claimed and these elements satisfy all structural, functional, operational, and spatial limitations currently in the claims. Therefore the standing rejections are proper and maintained.